

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, and 16-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, and 23 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 4, claim 8 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 12, claim 13 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 15, and claim 23 is amended to recite a second means for sensing. Claims 24-26 are new. Claims 4, 12, and 15 are cancelled.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicant and Applicant's undersigned representative thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the claims of the application in an Examiner Interview on April 28, 2004. In that interview, the art of record was discussed as it relates to claim 8. As shown on the Interview Summary form, it was agreed that the applied art does not render claim 8 unpatentable.

In the Office Action, claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In this Reply, Applicants amend claim 8 to more clearly set forth that the input device is remote from a work machine, as was discussed during the Examiner Interview. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Also in the Office Action, claims 8-12 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,739,811 to Rosenberg et al. (the Rosenberg patent). As agreed during the Examiner interview, the Rosenberg patent does not disclose all the features of claim 8. For example, the Rosenberg patent does not disclose a work machine. Nor does the Rosenberg patent disclose moving a hydraulic actuator on a work machine. Therefore, the Rosenberg patent does not anticipate claim 8.

The other references identified in the Office Action that "could have been applied in a rejection" also generally relate to an interface-type device for use in a computer gaming environment and fail to disclose all the features recited in claim 8. For example, they all fail to disclose a work machine and moving a hydraulic actuator on a work machine. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 8.

Information Disclosure Statement

With this Reply, Applicants submit an Information Disclosure Statement citing art including U.S. Patent No. 5,019,761 to Kraft. The Kraft patent discloses a force feedback control for a backhoe. However, Kraft does not disclose all the features recited in any of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 23. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-11, 14, 16-22, and 24-26 depend from and add additional features to independent claims 1, 8, and 13. Accordingly, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency. Applicants respectfully request that the allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 17, 2004

By: 

Dustin T. Johnson  
Reg. No. 47,684